

APPEAL NO. 040090
FILED FEBRUARY 27, 2004

This appeal arises pursuant to the Texas Workers' Compensation Act, TEX. LAB. CODE ANN. § 401.001 *et seq.* (1989 Act). A contested case hearing was held on December 15, 2003. The hearing officer determined that the appellant (claimant) is not entitled to supplemental income benefits (SIBs) for the sixth quarter. The claimant appeals this determination. The respondent (carrier) urges affirmance of the hearing officer's decision.

DECISION

Affirmed.

Section 408.142 provides that an employee continues to be entitled to SIBs after the first compensable quarter if the employee: (1) has not returned to work or has earned less than 80% of the employee's average weekly wage as a direct result of the impairment; and (2) has in good faith sought employment commensurate with his or her ability to work. At issue in this case is whether the claimant satisfied the good faith requirement for SIBs entitlement. Tex. W.C. Comm'n, 28 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 130.102(d)(2) (Rule 130.102(d)(2)) provides that an injured employee has made a good faith effort to obtain employment commensurate with the employee's ability to work if the employee has been enrolled in, and satisfactorily participated in, a full-time vocational rehabilitation program sponsored by the Texas Rehabilitation Commission (TRC) during the qualifying period. Alternatively, Rule 130.102(d)(5) provides that the good faith requirement may be satisfied if the claimant "has provided sufficient documentation as described in subsection (e)." Rule 130.102(e) states that "an injured employee who has not returned to work and is able to return to work in any capacity shall look for employment commensurate with his or her ability to work every week of the qualifying period and document his or her job search efforts." The rule then lists information to be considered in determining whether the injured employee has made a good faith effort, including, among other things, the number of jobs applied for, applications which document the job search, the amount of time spent in attempting to find employment, and any job search plan.

Whether the claimant satisfied the requirements of either Rule 130.102(d)(2) or Rule 130.102(d)(5) was a factual question for the hearing officer to resolve. The hearing officer is the sole judge of the relevance, materiality, weight, and credibility of the evidence presented at the hearing. Section 410.165(a). The hearing officer noted that while the claimant had contact with the TRC during the qualifying period corresponding to the sixth quarter, he was not enrolled in and satisfactorily participating in a TRC-sponsored program until after the expiration of the qualifying period. Additionally, the hearing officer noted that the claimant failed to document a job search during the 10th week of the qualifying period. For these reason, the hearing officer concluded that the claimant was not entitled to SIBs for the sixth quarter. Nothing in our

review of the record indicates that the hearing officer's decision is so against the great weight and preponderance of the evidence as to be clearly wrong or manifestly unjust. Cain v. Bain, 709 S.W.2d 175 (Tex. 1986).

The decision and order of the hearing officer are affirmed.

The true corporate name of the insurance carrier is **SENTRY INSURANCE, A MUTUAL COMPANY** and the name and address of its registered agent for service of process is

**TREVA DURHAM
1000 HERITAGE CENTER CIRCLE
ROUND ROCK, TEXAS 78664.**

Chris Cowan
Appeals Judge

CONCUR:

Gary L. Kilgore
Appeals Judge

Edward Vilano
Appeals Judge